

COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY
BEFORE THE PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION

In the Matter of:

APPLICATION OF FIBERLINE NETWORK)	
COMMUNICATIONS LIMITED PARTNERSHIP)	
FOR A CERTIFICATE OF PUBLIC CON-)	
VENIENCE AND NECESSITY TO PROVIDE)	CASE NO. 89-372
INTRASTATE OPERATOR-ASSISTED)	
RESOLD TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICES)	
AS A NONDOMINANT CARRIER)	

O R D E R

IT IS ORDERED that Fiberline Network Communications Limited Partnership ("FNCLP") shall file the original and ten copies of the following information with the Commission, with a copy to all parties of record. Each copy of the information requested should be placed in a bound volume with each item tabbed. When a number of sheets are required for an item, each sheet should be appropriately indexed, for example, Item 2, sheet 1 of 6. Include in each response the name of the witness who will be responsible for responding to questions relating to the information provided.

The information requested herein is due no later than February 28, 1990. If the information cannot be provided by this date, FNCLP should submit a motion for an extension of time stating the reason a delay is necessary and include a date by which it can be furnished. Such a motion will be considered by the Commission.

1. Has FNCLP ever provided and/or collected any money from users for the provision of intrastate telecommunications services in Kentucky? If so, provide a complete listing detailing the name and address of all persons paying any money to FNCLP, the amount of the money paid, the date FNCLP received the money, and copies of financial statements for the period of FNCLP's operation in Kentucky which show the income received by FNCLP from its intrastate telecommunications services.

2. Identify the facilities-based carriers whose services FNCLP intends to resell.

3. If FNCLP intends to resell tariffed services of facilities-based carriers, identify these tariffed services and specify whether these services will be obtained from intrastate or interstate tariffs.

4. If FNCLP intends to resell services that are not available under an approved tariff, provide copies of the contracts which govern the terms of the agreement between FNCLP and its facilities-based carriers.

5. Provide a clear and legible sketch showing all the switching locations and/or points-of-presence. Show how the facilities obtained from facilities-based carriers will be used to connect these locations. Include local access facilities, and identify the local access that will be used.

6. If switching locations and/or points-of-presence are located outside the Commonwealth of Kentucky, explain how FNCLP will ensure that intrastate access charges will be paid.

7. Explain how FNCLP will screen intraLATA traffic if FNCLP intends to resell services or facilities authorized only for interLATA traffic but which can carry intraLATA traffic.

8. Does FNCLP own and/or operate any transmission facilities in the Commonwealth of Kentucky or any other jurisdiction? If so, explain.

9. Does FNCLP have any affiliation with any other company which owns and/or operates any transmission facilities? If so, explain.

10. Specify the Kentucky counties which FNCLP proposes to serve.

11. Describe how calls will be transported from the customer's premises to the operator service centers. Include identification of FNCLP's switching locations, operator service locations, and identification of services and providers of the services being resold.

12. Specify the facilities and/or services used by FNCLP to transport calls from the customer's premises to FNCLP's originating point-of-presence, such as the types of access utilized (Feature Groups A, B, or D, special access, WATS, etc.). Identify the local exchange carriers from whom such access and/or services are purchased.

13. Specify the facilities and/or services used to bridge operators onto a call placed over the FNCLP network.

14. Provide a description of how such calls are transported to final termination points. Specify the facilities and/or services used to terminate calls.

15. Provide a copy of all current contracts entered into with any business, institution, and/or corporation for the provision of operator services by all of FNCLP's affiliates.

16. Explain how FNCLP handles emergency calls.

17. Explain how FNCLP's operators identify FNCLP to the end-user when handling an operator-assisted call.

18. Explain how FNCLP identifies itself as being the operator to transient users in cases where FNCLP provides operator-assisted services to hotels, schools, hospitals, and pay phones.

19. Explain how FNCLP transfers calls to other operator service providers when requested by an end-user.

20. Explain in detail FNCLP's calling card validation capabilities.

21. Provide an estimate of sales revenues for FNCLP's first 2 years of Kentucky operations. Explain how FNCLP arrived at these estimates. If estimates are based upon a market study, provide a copy of this study.

22. Provide a listing of financial institutions with which FNCLP has a line of credit. State FNCLP's credit line with each of these institutions.

23. Provide a toll-free number or provision for accepting collect calls for customer complaints.

24. Is FNCLP able to comply with each of the conditions of service for operator-assisted services as detailed in the


September 8, 1989 and January 15, 1990 Orders in Administrative Case No. 330?¹ Provide a detailed explanation of compliance for each condition of service.

25. State whether FNCLP is aware of the potential impact of Administrative Case Nos. 323 and 328,² now pending before this Commission, that may apply to FNCLP's Kentucky operations.

26. Explain why FNCLP's rates for holidays are not the same as the night rate.

Done at Frankfort, Kentucky, this 26th day of January, 1990.

PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION


For the Commission

ATTEST:


Executive Director

¹ Administrative Case No. 330, Policy and Procedures in the Provision of Operator-Assisted Telecommunications Services.

² Administrative Case No. 323, An Inquiry Into IntraLATA Toll Competition, an Appropriate Compensation Scheme for Completion of IntraLATA Calls by Interexchange Carriers, and WATS Jurisdictionality; Administrative Case No. 328, Investigation Into Whether WATS Resellers Should be Included in the ULAS Allocation Process.